

SCOTT, HON. WALTER.

Our land terms. Substance of speech by Hon. Walter Scott at Outlook October 6, 1910, dealing with Saskatchewan's Autonomy Land bargain. Regina Leader, (1910?).

*Scott*  
Rutherford

## OUR LAND TERMS

Substance of Speech by Hon. Walter Scott at Outlook, October 6, 1910, Dealing with Saskatchewan's Autonomy Land Bargain.

"If we are true Canadians can we afford to be careless about Canada's crying problem, the problem of peopling this vast country? Can we afford to ignore the national outlook and purpose and confine ourselves to the outlook and purpose of narrow provincialism? Are we not indeed serving the ends of our own prosperity best by helping to promote the speediest possible growth of the Dominion."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"We want no more than has been given Saskatchewan and Alberta."—Premier Roblin to Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

"Roblin declares that Manitoba wants no more than we possess. Roblin has no higher ambition for Manitoba than to obtain our terms. No stronger, no more effective, no more conclusive approval of the Saskatchewan land terms can be imagined."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"The position, then, is that the people, who form the court of last resort, have repeatedly endorsed these land terms in the belief that the province is better off financially with the cash grant than with lands which would have to be given away; and the Macdonald report together with Mr. Borden's proposal proves beyond doubt that we could not obtain the lands to use for provincial revenue. The opinion of the people was also doubtless affected by the fact that all of Mr. Haultain's party friends elsewhere in Canada and in Parliament denounced these land terms as being unduly generous to us; and even more affected by the further fact that in 1905 both Mr. Haultain and his chief party organ strongly approved the land arrangement. We have had, too, before our eyes Manitoba with a Conservative Government pleading with Laurier to give them Saskatchewan's terms and promising to be entirely satisfied with the same. Then the decision which has been given by the people upon the matter is amply justified by the broad consideration of policy as regards Canada's population problem. But the absolutely conclusive reason sustaining our position is that generous or the reverse, good or bad, satisfactory or not, the terms are the work of Parliament whose action cannot be attacked, whose authority was complete, and whose judgment in the matter is superior to that of any tribunal. Even if we wanted the lands and gave Mr. Haultain a mandate tomorrow to get them for the province, he could not do it, no, not if he lived and continued trying to do it for the next hundred years."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

## Pointed Paragraphs on the Autonomy Land Terms

"It is better for Canada and better for Saskatchewan as a part of Canada that the prairie lands should be managed by an authority which in the nature of things can afford to and actually does use these lands for colonization regardless of revenue."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

If Saskatchewan had the lands what would she be doing with them? Mr. Haultain tells you. We should be using them for revenue. This is the burden of his contention,—that the province is losing revenue by not having the lands." Premier Scott at Outlook.

"Do I hear some one say that the province could do its own immigration work as well as Ottawa does it? Mr. Haultain tells us that the province would not do it even if it could. He declares for a revenue policy with the lands."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"A colonization policy cannot be a revenue policy, nor can a revenue policy promote colonization."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"You agree that Canada in area and native resources is equal to Europe which counts its population by the hundreds of millions, while after a century's effort Canada only equals little Belgium in population,—little Belgium that is no bigger than the district of Swift Current which I represent. Yes, you agree with that. You also agree that we want to grow. Yes. You agree that the provinces owning their lands have utterly failed in colonization efforts. Yes. You agree that the federal colonization campaign for the prairie provinces is not a failure. Yes. Nobody can dispute these statements because the facts are common knowledge. Well, there you are. Would you, if you could, cancel the land bargain this minute?"—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"We want millions of additional people to aid in the task of developing our resources and to accelerate the rate of growth now being witnessed and which is unquestionably the result of the federal immigration campaign. We want to see these rich prairie lands all put under the plough. Unless we expand, the Grand Trunk Pacific and Hudson's Bay roads will be white elephants. It was not actual but prospective traffic which justified these big schemes. We want to see our present infant cities grow into St. Paul's, and Omahas and Kansas Cities. So I reiterate, what man here would cancel the land bargain even if he could."—Premier Scott, at Outlook.

"I repeat as a Canadian, and more than that, as a British subject, a citizen of the Empire, and anxious to see our Empire grow in strength, the land arrangement is better for Canada and better for the Empire. Provincial control of lands and immigration has notoriously failed. Federal control of lands and immigration is proving a success. Where the latter system governs strength for the Empire is being made rapidly."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"In the whole 43 years since Confederation, there is not a single province which owns its lands and does its own immigration work that has managed to double its population, excepting only British Columbia. And the more closely the British Columbia example is examined the stronger becomes my argument. Toronto is the home of more people than is the whole of British Columbia."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"How much of the lands will remain unsettled say thirty years hence? Unless our hopes fail, these lands within that period will all have become the homes and property of happy settlers. The lands thus settled will be an added strength to the Empire, but not a source of direct revenue to the Government controlling the domain whether provincial or federal."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"But we are in this eminently satisfactory position under our land terms that after every acre is owned privately and after all the old provinces have parted with their public domain, spent the proceeds, and ceased to reap revenue from that source, Saskatchewan will still be drawing \$1,125,000 a year from the Dominion Treasury on account of lands. No wonder Mr. Roblin and the people of his province are desirous of getting the same terms."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"Mr. Haultain would have you believe that I submit to our land bargain because I am a servile tool of Laurier. Why does Roblin submit? Why does not Roblin take possession of Manitoba's public domain? Why does not Mr. Haultain tell him how to do it? If the thing can be done in Saskatchewan it can be done as well in Manitoba."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"Parliament pledged its faith to the world that a large portion of those lands should be set apart for free homesteads. No transfer could therefore be made without exacting from the Province the most ample securities that

this pledged policy shall be maintained; hence in so far as the free lands extend there would be no monetary advantage to the province."—Sir John Macdonald to Manitoba in 1884.

"They are attacking Laurier for action the precedent for which was set by Sir John Macdonald. If Laurier's action was wicked so was Macdonald's. More, if the Western land policy is wrong Macdonald is the man to blame, not Laurier. Macdonald marked out the path, Laurier simply followed it. In 1870 when creating Manitoba Macdonald had a clean slate. He had to decide the principle. In 1905 Laurier was bound to observe the principle chosen by Macdonald or undo Macdonald's work. If Laurier had given the lands to Alberta and Saskatchewan it is obvious that the transfer of lands to Manitoba would have necessarily followed."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"To quote their 1867 utterances against Laurier's 1905 action cannot be very effective in the face of the fact that the Fathers of Confederation themselves made the precedent for Laurier's action when they created Manitoba in 1870. What sense is there in telling us that the Fathers of Confederation would have given Saskatchewan the lands? Deeds supersede words. In 1884, after seventeen years' experience in Confederation, Sir John Macdonald, the chief of those Fathers, refused to make the transfer to Manitoba."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"Entire equality as regards financial strength was my demand. Did I accept less? Let any impartial authority answer. Premiers Whitney and McBride, both Conservatives, have complained that Saskatchewan's terms make us financially stronger than Ontario and British Columbia. You know Premier Roblin's view."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"I am not unwilling to admit that an immediate income, increasing with population and certain in amount, may in the long run prove quite as satisfactory as any probable net income resulting from local administration of the public domain."—Ex-Premier Haultain in 1905.

"Quite as satisfactory financially! Proof out of an intensely unwilling mouth that Saskatchewan was receiving financial equality. What more did my 1901 and 1902 speeches demand?"—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"Mr. Scott deals with a subject on which The Standard is in entire accord with him,—the question of public lands. The Dominion will continue the very work to which we should have to apply the proceeds of the lands, viz., colonization. . . . But in addition to all this we are to get a land allowance which increases with population and which will in a short time aggregate a million dollars per annum. This looks all right for the new Province."—J. K. McInnis (1905) in The Standard, Regina.

"May I not rightfully suggest that men who praised the land bargain when it was before Parliament and when amendments and changes were possible, cut a sorry figure in denouncing the bargain at this time when the bargain is a legal and constitutional finality."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"As to the terms I am glad to be able to agree with Mr. Oliver: The terms in comparison with those granted to the other provinces are none too generous."—M. S. McCarthy, M.P., of Calgary (Conservative), in Parliament, 1905.

"Take it on any ground you like, and by the proportions which you have meted out to the North-West you have gone beyond the financial provisions of every other province of this Dominion."—Hon. Geo. E. Foster (Conservative deputy leader) in Parliament when debating the autonomy terms.

"Can I be wrong in holding that our terms secure us financial equality? Mr. Foster says we got more."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"It would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the price of these lands."—R. L. Borden in 1905.

"Give us the lands and bind us to give them away! Generous Mr. Borden! Ready to deny us liberty to use the lands for revenue,—declaring it to be the task of statesmanship to deny us that liberty if there was the slightest danger of our managing the lands for revenue instead of using them for colonization."—Premier Scott at Outlook.

"We did not make the bargain. We were not in office when it was made. We are as much responsible for the Customs Act as for the Saskatchewan Act with its land terms. Can any man find fault with my suggestion that Mr. Haultain adheres to this land bargain issue simply and wholly because he can find no proper ground of attack against us?"—Premier Scott at Outlook.

(Reprinted from The Leader, Regina, October 10, 1910.)

Premier Scott dealt mainly with the question of the autonomy land terms. First comprehensively reviewing the larger items of his government's policy as regards education, telephones, railways, public works, agriculture, finances, etc., he said that it was abundantly evident that beyond petty and trivial criticism here and there the opposition had no fault to find. The only sustained attack pretended by them was upon the autonomy land terms.

"The straits of the Opposition as regards finding any reasonable grounds of attack against the Government's record or policy is confessed by them," declared the Premier, "in their desire to keep the autonomy land bargain before the Province as an issue. They thereby confess that they lack any real ground of criticism. If I disliked the task of defending the bargain," Mr. Scott continued, "I might easily and quite truly plead that it is not a matter for which the Saskatchewan Government need take any responsibility. We did not make the bargain. We were not in office when it was made. Take the case of Alberta. Can the Sifton Government be held responsible for the terms which the Parliament of Canada gave Alberta? In reality the Saskatchewan Government had just as much or as little to do with the terms as had the Sifton Government in Alberta which was not in office until the Alberta Act had been in force nearly five years. The Saskatchewan Act embodying our terms had become law with all the force of any Act of Parliament carrying the assent of His Excellency the Governor-General before the Saskatchewan Government existed. The fact that I was a member of Parliament in 1905 helps to confuse this point. The correct view is more easily obtained in the case of Alberta. In reality the position of the two Governments in the matter is identical. Neither of them is responsible for the land terms. These were decided and granted by Parliament, the one and only body having authority to deal with the question. If in our Provincial affairs an attempt was made to use the customs tariff as an issue, what would be said? Yet we are as much responsible for the Customs Act as for the Saskatchewan Act with its land terms. I was in Parliament and voted for both Acts, but the Government of this province

cannot rightly be either blamed or praised for what I did in Parliament. The autonomy land bargain is not a legitimate political issue in the provincial field, and would not be used as an issue if the Opposition thought there was good ground on which to attack us in the sphere where we are really responsible.

"I am willing, not only willing but glad to defend the vote which I gave in Parliament in 1905 in favor of the land terms. In the first place let me allude to the main reason, the substantial reason why it was deemed better that the Dominion should retain possession of the lands. It hinged on the problem of peopling Canada. I have no hesitation in declaring it to be my belief that the

### Population Problem

is far away the most important Canadian political problem. See our position. In area equal to the United States with ninety millions of people. Excluding Russia, all the populous countries of Europe could be contained in our western provinces alone. As rich in natural resources as any equal area in the world. And today after two centuries of more or less civilized government and attempted development,—after forty-three years of Confederation,—today a full twenty-five years after the completion of the railway linking our Pacific and Atlantic provinces,—today all the people inhabiting this immensely large and rich country are no more in numbers than the people who live in London. Just think of it. A single city in the old world having as much population as the whole of Canada. Two new world cities, New York and Chicago, able to boast as many people as live in our half of the North American continent. Am I wrong in thinking that Canada's main problem is to increase her population? Am I not right in saying that in Canada the Dominion Government and its policies should be judged by results as shown in their effects in the way of enlarging our population? Now can anyone possibly doubt that an immigration policy carried on by one government and under single direction for the three western provinces is more effective than if each of these provinces was separately carrying on a campaign for more population? In the latter case there could not fail to be overlapping in the work and very likely conflict. There would be



a great deal of wasted effort and less direct result than is had from the campaign made under a single head. If the lands had been transferred to the provinces there would be in St. Paul, for instance, three Canadian immigration offices, one for each province. In some measure each of these offices would be working against the others. The three would certainly cost more than does the one maintained by the Dominion Government, and they would not be producing as much result. That such would be the fact cannot possibly be disputed. It is so clear that surely no person can fail to see it.

Well, if I am not wrong in my view of the importance of the population problem or in my view that a united immigration effort is more effective than divided efforts, then it follows that it was better for Canada and for Saskatchewan as a part of Canada that the Dominion should keep the western lands and continue operating the immigration department. If some one should say that the provinces could do this work as well for themselves, he will fail to find support for such view in the history of the provinces which do control their lands and therefore have had to do the work for themselves. In the whole forty-three years since the Confederation, there is not a single one of them which owns its lands and does its own immigration work that has managed to double its population, excepting only British Columbia. And the more closely the

#### British Columbia Example

is examined the stronger becomes my argument. British Columbia has been in Confederation forty years and has always owned and controlled its public domain. It is responsible for looking after its own immigration, and how has it succeeded? Why, the whole population of that immense Province today would scarcely make a respectable town in England or Germany. Toronto is the home of more people than is the whole of British Columbia. That Province cannot be said to lack advantages. Indeed it has simply untold natural riches. Why is the population so sparse after half a century's efforts? One reason is undoubtedly this, that the Provincial Government is more concerned about getting revenue out of the public domain than in using its lands, etc., for colonization purposes. The same would be true of Saskatchewan if this province owned the lands. Our interest in drawing new population would be secondary. We would want to use the lands for

revenue, and immigration would suffer. The British Columbia example when examined from the population standpoint proves very convincingly the wisdom of Parliament's decision in 1905 to adhere to the precedent set by the Parliament of 1870 when Manitoba was created and to continue to have the Western prairie lands managed by the Dominion authority. In 1905 I became thoroughly convinced in this idea, and year by year since then I have become more convinced. My experience with provincial affairs shows me more and more that if the Province owned the lands we should in the very nature of things be driven in our handling of them to make colonization secondary to revenue. We should soon be following in the footsteps of British Columbia and Ontario, that is to say, taking all the revenue that could possibly be got from the public domain, and leaving immigration to largely look after itself. Instead of our population enlarging by scores of thousands annually, we should have only Ontario's or British Columbia's rate of increase. Instead of our towns and cities doubling and trebling in size, their growth would be slow. Instead of gaining rapidly in strength at Ottawa through enlarging membership in Parliament, we should stand still. British Columbia entered Confederation with six M.P.'s. After forty years she has grown to seven. Ontario started with 82 M.P.'s and has now 86.

So I repeat that if I am right in saying that population is Canada's supreme problem, then I must be right also in saying that it is better for Canada and better for Saskatchewan as a part of Canada that the prairie lands should be managed by an authority which in the nature of things can afford to and actually does use these

#### Lands for Colonization

regardless of revenue. This is what the Dominion is doing with the lands. Not an acre is parted with without cultivation duties being attached to the grant. Every acre is being used to induce immigration, settlement and development. The result is seen in the great growth on all sides. More than 90,000 new settlers came to Canada during the months of April and May 1910. Our cities are expanding not only every year but every week. Railways are extending by the hundreds of miles. The companies cannot build them fast enough to meet the needs. When the census is taken next year we expect to find ourselves entitled

to larger representation at Ottawa. Larger population means more competition for the use of land and consequent increased land values, making richer every man who holds a quarter section or a town lot.

"Now who is there here who will look this situation in the face and fall to agree with the vote I gave in the Commons of 1905 in favor of a land bargain which would guarantee successful colonization as against the land scheme that has notoriously failed to promote colonization in every Province that owns its lands? You agree with me that Canada in area and native resources is equal to Europe which counts its population by the hundreds of millions while after a century's effort Canada only equals little Belgium in population—little Belgium that is no bigger than the district of Swift Current which I represent. Yes, you agree with that. You also agree that we want to grow. Yes. You agree that the Provinces owning their lands have utterly failed in colonization efforts. Yes. You agree that the federal colonization campaign for the prairie provinces is not a failure. Yes. Nobody can dispute these statements because the facts are common knowledge. Well, there you are. Would you, if you could, cancel the land bargain this minute? Would you put an end to the Dominion immigration effort? Would you compel the three prairie Provinces to do their own immigration work and open agencies outside to fight each other? If you would, then I should frankly question whether you are a patriotic Canadian. I yield first place to no man where the interests of Saskatchewan are concerned, but as a citizen of Saskatchewan I believe my paramount duty is to be a good Canadian. If it is better for Canada to have the population problem worked out in the most effective way, then whatever plan will yield such results is the plan best for Saskatchewan. This was one main reason for my vote in 1905 for the land bargain. I do not regret the vote.

"A saying which Nicholas Flood Davin often used was that you cannot eat your cake and have it. If Saskatchewan had the lands what would we be doing with them? Mr. Haultain tells you. We should be using them for revenue. This is the burden of his contention,—that the province is losing revenue by not having the lands. I do not need to argue the point that a homesteading policy is not a revenue policy. A colonization policy cannot be a revenue policy, nor can a revenue policy pro-

mote settlement. The history of every one of the Provinces which own the lands proves the point beyond dispute. You cannot use the lands for revenue and expect rapid settlement. You cannot eat your cake and have it too. Do I hear some one say that the Province could do its own immigration work as well as Ottawa does it? What need to answer that I don't believe it? Mr. Haultain tells us that the Province would not do it even if it could. He declares for a revenue policy with the lands. Unless such is his position, what is his position? He wants the lands for the Province so that we shall use them for revenue. He would put an end to the immigration work which is at last solving Canada's supreme problem, the problem of population. Now let us

### Face the Question Fairly

What man in Regina, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw or Prince Albert, what man in any of our expanding towns and villages, what man anywhere in Saskatchewan wants to see the present rate of growth checked? I may be told that we might as well enjoy what we have. Someone may say, 'Why want more people to divide with us what we have?' Let me in turn ask any old settler who was here in the eighties and nineties, was he more prosperous then than now? The same resources were here and there were fewer of us to divide up. Immigration was nil. There was no growth. Any old settler can tell you quickly whether the average citizen is better off when there is expansion generally rather than stagnation generally. Canada's population is too small to utilize advantageously Canada's natural resources. Up to a certain point increased population means increased prosperity for every person in Canada. That point is so far distant that just now it is nonsense to think of it. When we are seventy millions instead of seven millions, the point may have been reached. These twin Provinces alone, can contain Germany, France, Belgium, and Holland, whose population must number 125,000,000 souls, and still have room for New York and Massachusetts, two states which hold as many people as the whole population of Canada today. Yes, and there would be vacant area remaining equal to the area of all the British West Indian Islands, including Jamaica which latter island alone equals in population Alberta and Saskatchewan combined. And who dares declare that Canada is less capable of sustaining inhabitants

than any of those populous areas I have named? Until Canada's population reaches into the scores of millions it will remain true that each new Canadian must enhance the prosperity of every Canadian. We want millions of additional people to aid in the task of developing our resources and to accelerate the rate of growth now being witnessed and which is unquestionably the result of the federal immigration campaign. We want to see these rich prairie lands all put under the plough. Unless we expand, the Grand Trunk, Pacific and Hudson Bay roads will be white elephants. It was not actual but prospective traffic which justified these big schemes. We want to see our present infant cities grow into St. Pauls and Omahas and Kansas Cities. So I reiterate, what man here would cancel the land bargain now even if he had the power?

### How Could it be Cancelled?

I have dealt somewhat lengthily with the important and broad question of policy from the standpoint of Canada which governed the land bargain. Next let us examine the question of our power in the matter, because unless the Province can cancel the bargain any man who fights in behalf of Mr. Haultain's policy on the land question is simply tilting at a windmill. Let us suppose that my vote in 1905 was wrong. Let us suppose, too, that the Saskatchewan Government ought to be dismissed on that account. Also let us suppose that it were wise to stop immigration work and to have the lands transferred to the provinces to be used for the purpose of provincial revenues. Lastly, suppose that Mr. Haultain is in office on the strength of this collection of suppositions. It is his policy to acquire the lands. He has been elected to get the lands. How will he go about it? I listen with both ears open to learn how he will do it. In 1905 and to-day I believed and believe it better that we should have money in lieu of lands, but I can conceive of changed conditions which might lead me in 1920 or 1930 to want the public domain for the province and against such a day I should really like to know what machinery exists to turn the trick. My curiosity is perfectly sincere. If there is a method by which Saskatchewan can take possession of the lands I should really like to see its outline. Has Mr. Haultain explained how he would do it? Not yet. This is not the first time he has been asked to show how the thing could be done. Five years ago, at Duck Lake, a young lawyer named Turgeon pro-

pounded the question. Mr. Haultain's dignity would not suffer him to answer an upstart lawyer—so he said. I assure you that such was his answer and his only answer. But the young man Turgeon is now Attorney-General. Nobody who has sat through the last three sessions of our House thinks that Mr. Haultain's dignity need longer prevent him dealing with Mr. Turgeon's question. The young man has proved himself at least the older man's equal in law, in linguism, in rhetoric and otherwise. I might say more, but the young man is my colleague and I will be modest in his praises. His question during five years has remained unanswered. Let us not unduly hurry Mr. Haultain. It has been said of him,—by his friends, too,—that he likes neither hard work nor hasty methods. He was asleep and caught by surprise in 1908, so his friends never cease to complain. They assert and reiterate that but for my unseemly speed his party might have done better in the elections. I must hereafter try to accommodate myself to his ways. Peradventure Mr. Haultain yet sleepeth. But surely between now and the next election contest, which will likely be three years hence, he may be expected to awake and tell us how he will obtain the lands when Saskatchewan changes its mind and elects him to do it. I have questioned lawyers and I have yet to learn how it could be done. They tell me that the thing is impossible. But let Mr. Haultain take plenty of time. If he cannot answer this year, perhaps he may be able to answer next year or the year after. Of course you will want his answer before you vote for his policy to cancel the land bargain. Unless he can show you that he is able to obtain the lands he can scarcely expect you to support him and his policy. He would cut an absurd figure as head of the Saskatchewan Government elected to take control of the lands and helpless to devise a scheme for bringing his policy into effect. Imagine him in office and pledged to secure the public domain. What I want to know is how he would set about it. The lawyers tell me the idea is preposterous. When he does deign to explain how he will do it, probably we shall hear something about another test case. He is strong on test cases. But no lawyer has yet succeeded in showing me how the Government can bring a test case against the land bargain. If there is an opening for a test case at all, Mr. Haultain in his law office can bring it without waiting for an election. I am advised that no means exist by which the Government can bring it. If there is a way let him show it to me. But if a test

case could be taken I need no lawyer to tell me how it would end. The case would fail. Let me tell you why I know it would fail.

### The Power of Parliament

"The Imperial authority passed the British North America Act, the instrument of Confederation, in 1867. Amongst other things the B. N. A. Act provided for the acquisition by Canada of Rupert's Land and the North West Territory and advantage was taken of this provision shortly after Confederation. In 1870 Parliament created Manitoba out of the acquired territory and retained to itself the public domain of Manitoba notwithstanding that all the other Provinces owned their public domain. In this and some other respects the Manitoba terms differed from the terms of the original Provinces. Now please pay attention to this. A question arose as to the authority of Parliament to make these variations, and the Imperial Legislature in 1871 was requested to enact an Act and it did enact an Act ratifying and confirming the Manitoba Act, and while it was about it the Imperial Legislature enacted a further clause which specifically empowers the Canadian Parliament to repeat in the case of further new Provinces what it had done in the Manitoba case. The Imperial Act to which I refer is called the B. N. A. Act 1871. The language of this Act and indeed the whole matter is so plain that no legal training is needed to grasp it. In 1870 Canada retained the Manitoba lands. In 1871 the Imperial Legislature ratified the action and amended the B. N. A. Act, 1867, so that no ratification would be needed for similar action as regards additional Provinces. So when Parliament retained the Saskatchewan lands its authority to do so was absolutely beyond dispute. No lawyer of standing will think of disputing it. The power of Parliament to retain the lands was and is absolute and unquestionable.

### Haultain Would Be Helpless

"It therefore follows that Mr. Haultain would be utterly helpless to obtain the lands. The Province has no more power to take possession of the lands than it has to obtain the moon. Parliament's authority to enact the Saskatchewan Act was as complete as its authority to enact the Customs Act, and the land bargain has no more place as an issue in our provincial affairs than has any tariff schedule. Mr. Haultain knows the fact as well as I do. But he is an adept quibbler. I want you to watch him and see if he will commit himself to a straight promise to obtain the lands for Sas-

katchewan in the event of his policy (or what he pretends is a policy) respecting the land bargain being sustained at the polls. Unless he is simply quibbling he will not withhold the promise.

### Roblin's Opinion

"One would think, listening to Mr. Haultain, that Manitoba ought to have taken up this land question long ago. Manitoba surely has a stronger reason than Saskatchewan. At the end of 1910, our fifth year, we will have received on land account a total of \$2,343,750, apart from the school lands proceeds. Canada holds the lands of Manitoba also, but in the same five years, Manitoba had received in lieu thereof only \$500,000. Manitoba has vastly more cause to complain. Why does Manitoba not act on the Haultain policy? For eleven years past Mr. Haultain's party friends have governed Manitoba. If the Haultain land bargain contention is good in Saskatchewan it must be even better in Manitoba. In the next five years the land bargain will give us a cash total of about \$2,800,000 as against \$500,000 to Manitoba in the same period. As a matter of fact Premier Roblin does contend that the Manitoba land terms are unfair.

"Mr. Haultain would have you believe that I submit to our land bargain because I am a servile tool of Laurier. Roblin is surely no tool of Laurier. Why does Roblin submit? Why does not Roblin take possession of Manitoba's public domain? Why does not Mr. Haultain tell him how to do it? If the thing can be done in Saskatchewan it can be done as well in Manitoba.

"The truth is that Premier Roblin knows and does not hesitate to declare that Mr. Haultain upon the land question is talking nonsense. Roblin admits the fact, which is that the idea of disputing the power of Parliament in this matter is the rankest absurdity. Speaking in the House at Winnipeg in January, 1908, on the question of the enlargement of Manitoba, Premier Roblin made this clear statement on the point:—

"Constitutionally, if we could wrest from the Dominion to-day this whole territory that we claim, it would not carry with it,—without some provision to the contrary by the Parliament of Canada,—it would not carry with it one acre of land, one stick of timber, one ounce of mineral deposit or one fish that swims in the lakes, rivers and streams."

"Mr. Roblin merely stated the plain fact. Not only is Parliament's authority absolute, but as Mr. Roblin admits and declares, the B. N. A. Act



when extended to the Northwestern Territory by the formation of a Province does not give the lands to the province. If the Saskatchewan Act had contained no mention of the lands, these lands would still belong to Canada. In other words had the Saskatchewan Act simply defined our boundaries, given the Province a name, and then made the Province subject to the B. N. A. Act, the public domain would not have become the property of the province. The assertion that the B. N. A. Act automatically applied would give the lands to the province is untrue. A transfer of the lands would require, as Mr. Roblin states, some specific provision by Parliament.

"Mr. Haultain in office in Saskatchewan could no more take possession of the lands than can Premier Roblin do it in Manitoba. This land bargain issue in Saskatchewan is a false issue. For practical purposes we might as well discuss stopping the sun in its course. The Government of Saskatchewan can as easily stop the sun as cancel the land bargain. Mr. Haultain in his present position has just as much power to change the bargain or to stop the sun as he would possess were he head of the Government. He would not be relying on the question at all if he had any legitimate ground on which to attack us. In the first place, as I have shown we as a Government had nothing to do with the bargain. We did not exist when the terms were framed and decided by Parliament. These terms are a part of the Saskatchewan Act, and we could not have had prior existence because the Province itself came into being by virtue of the Act and the Province had to be born before it could have a Government. I seek to escape none of my personal responsibility for my course in Parliament, but in my capacity as head of the provincial government I say I have absolutely no responsibility for the land terms and my colleagues might just as fairly be held responsible for the wreck of the Hesperus. In the second place the Province is powerless to alter the terms and therefore it is senseless and absurd to drag the question into provincial politics. But in addition to these considerations I repeat as a Canadian, and more than that as a British subject, a citizen of the Empire, and anxious to see our Empire grow in strength, the land arrangement is better for Canada and for the Empire. Provincial control of lands and immigration has notoriously failed. Federal control of lands and immigration is proving a success. Where the latter system governs, strength for the Empire is being made rapidly, and a sys-

tem which is producing good results for the Empire and for Canada is a system good also for Saskatchewan, which is proud of her partnership both in the Empire and in Canada.

### The History of Precedent

"Probably you think that I have from my standpoint made a complete enough case already, but I have only begun. If time permitted, I could bring, to quote an illustrious Canadian, 'mountains of evidence,' to sustain the Liberal position on this land question. I assure you that it is not on account of lack of defence that I complain against the dragging in of the issue, because our position is sound and strong while the Opposition ground is easily upset. The Conservative attack is weak in this; that they are attacking Laurier for action the precedent for which was set by Sir John Macdonald. Conservatives revere Macdonald as a brilliant, righteous, sagacious and successful statesman. How can they expect belief in their sincerity when they pretend that Laurier deprived and robbed Saskatchewan of its rights and still continue to praise and bless Macdonald? If Laurier's action was wicked, so was Macdonald's. More, if the Western land policy is wrong, Macdonald is the man to blame, not Laurier. Macdonald marked out the path, Laurier simply followed it. In 1870 when creating Manitoba Macdonald had a clean slate. He had to decide the principle. In 1905 Laurier was bound to observe the principle chosen by Macdonald or undo Macdonald's work. If Laurier had given the lands to Alberta and Saskatchewan it is obvious that the transfer of lands to Manitoba would have necessarily followed.

"Macdonald created Manitoba in 1870. Note the date—three years after Confederation. The Fathers of Confederation were still in harness. It is unnecessary for me to say that Sir John Macdonald was the chief of them. Now you are told that the Fathers of Confederation held the principle of local control of lands to be the keystone of Confederation. This is one of the most plausible arguments which they quote. I remember that I used to quote the same argument in Parliament in the years between 1900 and 1905 when I was doing my part in helping to educate eastern sentiment for our autonomy negotiations. But the argument had a fatal weakness, and we have it here. The action of Macdonald, and the other Fathers of Confederation in 1870 in dealing with Manitoba shows either that they had lost confidence in the principle or believed that it did not need to apply in the

case of new provinces carved out of the Hudson's Bay territory. To quote their 1867 utterances against Laurier's 1905 action cannot be very effective in face of the fact that the Fathers of Confederation themselves made the precedent for Laurier's action when they created Manitoba in 1870. The only difference between Macdonald and Laurier is that the latter dealt with Saskatchewan generously whereas the former gave Manitoba in lieu of the lands a starvation grant. The record fully justifies my language. The grant provided by Macdonald for Manitoba in lieu of lands in 1870 was only \$45,000 per annum, and within a dozen years Manitoba was actually starving. The province was driven to demand better terms. John Norquay was Premier. He demanded the lands. May we not ask why he neglected to take possession of them? Why beg of Sir John Macdonald at Ottawa what Mr. Haultain says the province had power to do itself? Now let me quote a bit of important history bearing directly on the whole subject. The Macdonald Government was finally moved to action by the Manitoba 'Better Terms' agitation, and in the year 1884 made a report, which said in part:

"The success of the undertakings by the Dominion Government in and for the North-West depends largely upon the settlement of the lands. Combined with a great expenditure in organizing and maintaining an immigration service abroad and at home, Parliament pledged its faith to the world that a large portion of those lands should be set apart for free homesteads to all coming settlers and another portion to be held in trust for the education of their children. No transfer could, therefore, be made without exacting from the province the most ample securities that this pledged policy shall be maintained; hence in so far as the free lands extend there would be no monetary advantage to the province, whilst a transfer would most assuredly seriously embarrass all the costly immigration operations which the Dominion Government is making mainly in behalf of Manitoba and the Territories.

"The great attraction which the Canadian Government now offers, the impressive fact to the mind of the men contemplating immigration is that a well-known and recognized government holds unfettered in its own hands the lands which it offers free, and that that government has its ag-

encies and organizations for directing, receiving, transporting and placing the immigrant on the homestead which he may select. And if the immigration operations of the Dominion, which involve so large a cost, are to have continued success, and to be of advantage to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, it is deemed of the utmost importance that the Dominion shall retain and control the lands which it has proclaimed free to all comers. Were there other considerations of sufficient force to induce the recommendation of their transfer to Manitoba, and as a consequence and by precedent the surrender to the provinces to be created from the North-West Territory, all the lands within their boundaries, then it would be advisable that the provinces holding the lands should conduct their own immigration operations at their own expense.

"There is not a sentence in the extract I have read which is not highly significant in relation to the land arrangement of Saskatchewan. The argument itself is powerful, and its authorship makes it the more powerful. How does Mr. Haultain meet the citation? He cannot meet it. He has never yet attempted to meet it. The Macdonald report was quoted in Parliament in 1905. I have quoted it before. Mr. Haultain has been discussing this land question all these years but nobody has yet heard him try to meet Sir John Macdonald's mature and reasoned opinion justifying the policy of the Dominion's retention of the western prairie lands. What sense is there in telling us that the Fathers of Confederation would have given Saskatchewan the lands? Deeds supersede words. No matter what Canada's parents said prior to 1867, we have their act in 1870 when they retained Manitoba's lands and in 1884 after seventeen years' experience in Confederation, Sir John Macdonald, the chief of those fathers, refused to make the transfer to Manitoba for the reasons set out in his report,—reasons which are at least as cogent to-day as regards the three prairie provinces as in 1884 in relation to Manitoba. Again I point out that no man can condemn Laurier in this matter without condemning Macdonald. I should not forget to state that the Manitoba better terms demand was met in 1884 by an increase in the annual money grant from \$45,000 to \$100,000, and the grant of certain swamp lands. "I do not think that Mr. Haultain has been silly enough to do it, but

certain of his supporters have recently gone the absurd length of asserting that Manitoba's terms are better than ours. What can Premier Roblin think of that?

### Manitoba Wants Equality With Us

"The assertion simply advertises the maker of it as either foolish or dishonest or both. The assertion is laughable in view of Premier Roblin's reiterated declarations. In the recent Manitoba election campaign Roblin's cry was for equality with Saskatchewan, that was all he wanted. Let me give you Roblin's own words:

"We ask that the terms and conditions be the same as apply to Saskatchewan and Alberta. We are asking for the same terms and conditions as have been given Alberta and Saskatchewan. We want no more than has been given them; we will accept no less and feel that justice has been done us."

"Why in heaven's name should Premier Roblin appeal for our terms if Manitoba's terms are already better than ours? Roblin declares that Manitoba wants no more than we possess. No stronger, no more effective, no more conclusive approval of the Saskatchewan land terms can be imagined. What I have quoted was Roblin's statement in 1908. Again this present year, on the 8th January last, Premier Roblin wrote officially to Sir Wilfrid Laurier as follows:

"We will be entirely satisfied whether you elect to give us a position of equality under terms and conditions that govern your treatment of Alberta and Saskatchewan to the west or of Ontario and Quebec to the east."

"Entirely satisfied? Roblin has no higher ambition for Manitoba than to obtain our terms. Am I going too far when I suggest a doubt as to the sanity of any Saskatchewan man who complains against our land terms? Can Mr. Haultain really be in his right senses when he fulminates against terms which are such as his party friend Roblin declares would entirely satisfy Manitoba?

### Our Land Allowance

What are these terms? First a payment of \$93,750 a year for five years as a grant towards new buildings. Then an annual cash grant forever on a sliding scale based on our population—beginning in 1905 at \$375,000 on estimated population of 250,000. If we have 400,000 people in 1911 when the census is taken, the land grant will be thereafter

\$562,000. At 800,000 souls the allowance increases again, and at 1,200,000 we obtain the final increase to \$1,125,000 a year, which sum in cash the province will then receive annually forever. Pray do not overlook the fact that the bargain secures to the province a cash payment of \$1,125,000 every year as long as Confederation exists. I emphasise the point because a few weeks ago at the end of a meeting a man told me that he was surprised to hear it. He was an old-timer, too, and a man who takes an interest in elections, but he was so surprised to hear that the land terms gave us the large cash grant in perpetuity that he came to ask whether he had understood me aright. He assured me that the information left him in no further doubt as to the excellence of the terms. Keep in mind that the public domain in Saskatchewan consists largely of agricultural lands. How much of it will remain unsettled say thirty years hence? Unless our hopes fail these lands within that period will all have become the homes and property of happy settlers. The lands thus settled will be an added strength to the nation and to the Empire, but not a source of direct revenue to the government controlling the domain whether provincial or federal. With control of the lands the day would assuredly come sooner or later when they would yield no revenue for the simple reason that possession of them will have gone into private hands, but our bargain secures to us forever a cash payment every year of \$1,125,000. I hear it said that certain provinces are reaping this large sum and that large sum from their public domain. How long will the process last? They are living on their capital. Even coal and other mines become exhausted, and a depleted mine will yield no more royalties. This is the year 1910. Look forward to the year 2010 and tell me what revenues the public domain will then be yielding to those provincial governments which to-day are using the proceeds of it for running expenses. And yet one hundred years is only a short time in the life of a nation. We can not see far into the future and forecasts made to-day may turn out wide of the mark, but the likelihood is strong that long before a century passes away the public domain in most parts of Canada will be a negligible quantity. One very certain thing is that at the present successful rate of settlement a very few years will leave no public domain south of township 50 in Saskatchewan. But we are in this eminently satisfactory position under our land

terms that after every acre is owned privately and after all the old provinces have parted with their public domain, spent the proceeds and ceased to reap revenue from that source, Saskatchewan will still be drawing \$1,125,000 a year from the Dominion treasury on account of lands. No wonder Mr. Roblin and the people of his province are desirous of getting the same terms. No one but a crazy man or a jaundiced partisan bereft of a legitimate issue would ever think of being other than 'entirely satisfied' with such a favorable arrangement."

### Scott's Position Prior to 1905

"If the terms are good, probably nobody cares much what Mr. Haultain or myself or anybody else thought or said about prospective terms prior to 1905. The opposition chief stock-in-trade on the question seems to be some speeches which I made in parliament before 1905. I think I may truly say for those speeches that for a beginner they were not discreditable, and further that they helped not a little to accomplish their purpose, which was to bring about, in the eastern provinces and amongst the eastern public men who dominated parliament then even more than they do now, an interest in our autonomy question and some understanding of it. When I went to Ottawa in 1900 the proposal that new western provinces would have any right to the lands or recognition of a monetary interest in the lands, simply brought a stare of astonishment to the face of the average eastern man in or out of parliament. I think it speaks volumes for the efforts made by the handful of westerners that in the short five years between 1900 and 1905 such interest was aroused, such an awakening brought about, so much done towards leading the east to understand, such an entire change in sentiment effected, as to enable Laurier in 1905 to carry through parliament the measure which so handsomely and emphatically recognizes in a monetary sense the provincial interest in the lands. In 1900, I repeat, such a measure would have been laughed out of parliament and the eastern public would have thought that Laurier must have lost his senses to propose it.

"I believe in giving credit where it is due, and I say freely that Mr. Haultain did magnificent work in the campaign. I looked to him as my leader in that effort. He made strong speeches at home, and I did what I could in the East to emphasise his arguments. It was not by milk-and-water statements nor by half-hearted

work that the ground was prepared for the autonomy measures of 1905. And I suppose it is the irony of political fate that the work I did during that time should be held as a matter of offence against me now. Is it usual, however, to blame the seller,—be it a horse or a farm or a railroad,—is it usual to blame the seller because he accepted a lower price than he had declared when first negotiating that the property was worth? Or do you condemn the buyer for paying more than the amount of his first declaration of the value of the article? Why, with my own ears I heard Mr. Haultain himself in 1903 on the floor of the old Assembly defend and define his position in almost those very words. Dr. Patrick attacked him and his autonomy demands, holding that Mr. Haultain had injured the Western claim by making extravagant demands. Mr. Haultain answered that his position was that of a man with property to sell and it was his duty to name a price over the mark rather than under the mark. Mr. Haultain also said that his autonomy demands certainly did include everything that his ingenuity had discovered to ask for. His duty was to make the demand. It was for Ottawa to examine and see how far the demand was reasonable.

"When the transaction was concluded Ottawa had vastly exceeded its first proposal of grants, and if the bargain secures to Saskatchewan less than the demands framed by Mr. Haultain and which at Ottawa from 1900 to 1905 I exerted every effort to emphasise, am I to be condemned? Am I to be held guilty because I accept less than the demands which Dr. Patrick denounced as extravagant and which Mr. Haultain himself admitted he never expected to obtain in full? Indeed does not this particular criticism against me smack of unfairness? Is it not striking below the belt?

"Anyway, if my speeches are to be quoted I should like them to be quoted without distortion. Prior to 1905 I certainly did urge in Parliament the principle of local ownership of the lands. The real purpose behind my speeches I have explained to you. But they do not quote those speeches fairly. Let me give you the key-note of those speeches. I quote from the Hansard of 1901:

"Entire equality is the only sure guarantee of the permanency of the confederation structure. The subjects that come under the purview of the local government affect the people more closely than those subjects dealt with by this Parliament, and the best way to promote the progress of that part of Canada will



be to give as much financial ability as possible to the local legislatures to deal with their local affairs, so that education, public works and all local services may be efficiently and adequately dealt with. My opinion is that by no other means can Parliament do as much at one stroke to promote the progress and true welfare, not of the Territories alone, but of Canada as a whole, as by placing the main portion of Western Canada in a strong, efficient, capable position as concerns its local government."

"Looking back over the autonomy negotiations and the terms secured I find no reason to accuse myself of inconsistency. The views I expressed in 1901 have been amply justified by the results following our provincial establishment. In the five years since these new local legislatures were placed in a 'strong, efficient, capable' position, the progress 'not of the Territories alone, but of Canada as a whole' has exceeded all expectations. Entire equality as regards financial strength was my demand. Did I accept any less? Let any impartial authority answer. Premiers Whitney and McBride, both Conservatives, have complained that Saskatchewan's terms make us financially stronger than Ontario and British Columbia. You know Premier Roblin's view.

#### Haultain Never Expected the Lands

"When urging the principle of local ownership of the lands, I know that all I hoped was to obtain recognition of our right of proprietary interest in them. I certainly never expected the actual transfer to the new Provinces. And I am equally certain that Mr. Haultain did not expect it and did not want it. Of this fact I am as certain as of the fact that the sun rises in the East. Such was always my understanding from him and his colleagues. It was always clear—the Macdonald report of 1884 showed it,—that an actual transfer of the lands would mean immigration responsibility and the cost of the homesteading system. To the fact that Mr. Haultain never expected nor wanted the lands, you may remember that in our first campaign in 1905 I was able to produce a sworn statement made by Mr. S. MacLeod of Prince Albert, a Member of the old Assembly. Mr. MacLeod declared upon oath that to him Mr. Haultain had said in 1902 that it was nonsense to think of an actual transfer of the lands, but he had to demand them so as to establish a basis of negotiations for the revenue which the Province must obtain in lieu of the lands.

"But whatever was Mr. Haultain's inmost opinion on that point,—and

what he or I or you thought or said ten years ago is of little importance if the bargain granted us is good,—whatever was his real view about the lands, he cannot escape his own certificate given the financial excellence of the land terms when these terms were first made public. I happen to know that when Mr. Haultain first heard the actual terms which Ottawa had agreed to give, these terms fairly took his breath. The new provinces were obtaining so much more than he had expected that he could scarcely believe the report. That he gave signs of pleasure I will not say. In 1905 he had become a bitter Tory partisan, and the more the Government left him room to complain the better he was pleased. He would have been less disappointed had the terms been poorer. In a few days he published a lengthy letter of complaint against the Autonomy Bills, denouncing the school clause, the making of two Provinces instead of one, the dividing line, etc., and urging that the lands should be transferred. But complain as he would the truth compelled from even him the admission that financially the land terms were fair. These were his own words:

"But I am not unwilling to admit that an immediate income, increasing with population and certain in amount, may in the long run prove quite as satisfactory as any probable net income resulting from local administration of the public domain."

"Quite as satisfactory financially! Proof out of an intensely unwilling mouth that Saskatchewan was receiving financial equality! What more did we want? What more did my 1901 and 1902 speeches demand? In his letter Mr. Haultain urged the transfer of the lands as a matter of principle, but he agreed that as a matter of business the money grants were equally satisfactory. Well, as to the principle, the more I study the question the more I disagree with his principle. For the good of Canada, for the up-building of the Empire, it is vastly better to have the lands controlled by an authority that can afford to colonize them. The moment I saw hope of procuring a land allowance to make the new provinces financially 'strong, efficient and capable,' the moment Ottawa showed a disposition to provide us an immediate income, increasing with population and certain in amount, the moment we obtained assurance of financial equality with the original Provinces, that moment I ceased to press for the transfer of the lands and I acted upon the sincere and honest conviction,—which was not reached without years of careful enquiry and consideration,—that the arrangement proposed was best for the new provinces

and best for the Dominion of Canada. Cries of inconsistency and treachery are cheap. If Saskatchewan under her autonomy terms and with her land bargain enjoys a position of financial equality in the sisterhood of Canadian Provinces, if the Alberta and Saskatchewan land scheme which I helped to frame is working successfully both for the provinces and for Canada, these cries of inconsistency and treachery will not disturb me because I have been guilty of neither. Let Mr. Haultain look to the consistency of himself and his lieutenants. He charges now that we are robbed of revenue by the land terms. When the terms were before Parliament he declared that in a revenue sense the arrangement was quite as satisfactory as a transfer of the lands. That is his consistency, that is his faithfulness to truth. Does he allege that his 1905 estimate of the terms was mistaken? If so, may not I plead that honest error on my part would be no more criminal than the same on his part? And take the case of one of his chief party lieutenants, the president of his political organization, the pretended Provincial Rights Association, and as well the editor of his chief party organ, Mr. J. K. McInnis of the Regina Standard. What was his opinion of the land bargain in 1905? Before the terms were decided Mr. McInnis in *The Standard* urged most strongly against a transfer of the lands. He urged that 'the new provinces could not be easily equipped for the onerous duties' which would necessarily follow such transfer, and he declared that 'a handsome equivalent either in cash or interest-bearing credit will suit the new provinces much better than the extra responsibilities which are involved in the ownership and control of the public domain.' He pleaded that 'the good work of the Dominion Immigration Department must go on undisturbed.' A handsome equivalent instead of the lands, was *The Standard's* demand. Under interesting, even dramatic circumstances, at Wolseley prior to the 13th December, 1905, on the public platform I met this shining example of honor and decency whom Mr. Haultain had taken to his bosom, and he had the brazen hardihood,—to say nothing of respect for truth,—to denounce the land terms. I quoted to the audience some of his own words which I have just given you. What do you think he replied? His reply was that it all depended on the equivalent, and since he had seen the details of the terms he found they were insufficient. You have heard of slippery gentlemen. Mr. McInnis holds no second place in the

### Slippery Elm Class

"But wiggle as he will Mr. McInnis cannot slip away in this instance. 'Oh, that mine enemy might write a book!' These slippery customers ought never to write. Had Mr. Haultain not spread his bad liver over a complaining letter we would not have his certificate of approval of the land bargain with which to upset his present position. Listen to this further effusion on the land terms,—after he had seen and digested them,—from the pen of the King of the Slippery League:

"Mr. Scott in his great speech delivered some days ago in the House of Commons, first deals with a subject on which *The Standard* is in entire accord with him,—the question of public lands. The Dominion will continue the very work to which we should have to apply the proceeds of the lands, viz., colonization. The central power at Ottawa will continue to grant free homesteads from these lands; the work of the Immigration Department, so successfully organized and vivified by Mr. Sifton, will be continued under Mr. Oliver, who is still more closely in touch with the present Territories. With the retention of the lands remains the responsibility of aiding our colonization lines of railway. But in addition to all this we are to get a Land Allowance which increases with the population and which will, in a short time, aggregate a million dollars per annum. This looks all right for the new Province. The Dominion will carry on our colonization work, and at the same time give us a gradually increasing and perpetual Land Allowance. Long before the Bill was introduced, *The Standard*, in an article which is now spread word for word upon Hansard, outlined this as the probable policy.

"Comment would be like trying to gild refined gold or to paint the lily. But may I not rightfully suggest that men who praised the land bargain when it was before Parliament and when amendments and changes were possible, cut a sorry figure in denouncing the bargain at this time when the bargain is a legal and constitutional finality. Mr. Haultain will have his hands full enough if he attends to the treacheries and inconsistencies in his own party camp.

### Eastern Conservatives' Views

"I will not weary you with more long quotations, but the general Conservative comment in Parliament upon the bargain deserves to be remembered. There was Mr. Foster's warning to the Minister of Finance in these words:

"Take it on any ground you like, and by the proportions which you have meted out to the North-West, you have gone beyond the financial conditions of every other Province of this Dominion."

"Can I be wrong in holding that our terms secure us financial equality? Mr. Foster says that we got more. Then there was Mr. Monk's complaint against Canada 'paying this enormous indemnity, these millions of dollars to keep a hold on the lands of the North-West,' which lands according to Mr. Wilson of Lennox 'cost more to administer than we are getting out of them.' Mr. Wilson agreed that the new Provinces should have the terms with delight, 'provided Canada keeps the land for the settlers because the provinces get the benefit of the lands inasmuch as they get the people who settle on them, and get the money besides, while Canada gives away the lands from time to time but continues for all time to pay those subsidies.' Indeed the chorus of Tory complaint in Parliament against what they called the undue generosity of the terms became so loud that the North-West Tory Members were driven to plead for the terms, and Mr. McCarthy of Calgary made the following appeal:

"As to the terms I am glad to be able to agree with Mr. Oliver. In discussing these terms it is unfair to make comparisons with the terms of the Eastern Provinces. The conditions are altogether different. The financial terms in comparison with those granted to the other provinces are none too generous."

"Considering their source,—coming from a North-West Tory Member,—I think that no more significant words were uttered in Parliament by way of comment on the terms granted the new Provinces."

#### Unrestricted Transfer Not Proposed

"Now I want you to bear in mind Sir John Macdonald's answer to Manitoba in 1884,—the assertion that no transfer of lands could possibly be made without the province giving ample securities to continue and maintain the homesteading policy. I want you to remember Macdonald's view in connection with a suggestion put forward in the 1905 debate upon this land problem by Mr. R. L. Borden who is Mr. Haultain's Ottawa leader and Sir John Macdonald's successor. Mr. Borden said that he favored transferring the lands to the provinces, and in reply

to the objection that colonization might suffer, he went on to say this:

"May we not rightly conclude that if these lands are handed over to them, they will so deal with them as to best conserve their own interests by forwarding and assisting a vigorous policy of immigration? Might I not further suggest that even if there were any danger,—and I do not think there is,—it would be the task of good statesmanship to have inserted, if necessary, a provision in this Bill with regard to free homesteads and the prices of these lands, and obtain to it the consent of the people of the North-West Territories."

"If there were any danger,—danger of what? If there were any danger of the provinces failing to maintain the vigorous immigration and homesteading policy which upon parting with the lands the Dominion could no longer carry on. In face of the record of Ontario, British Columbia and all the old provinces, Mr. Borden pretended to believe no such danger need be feared. But if there were any danger he would exact the same pledge which Sir John Macdonald said would be essential. Provincial rights! Ye gods and little fishes! Give us the lands and bind us to give them away! Generous Mr. Borden! Insert a provision in the transfer with regard to free homesteads and the prices of these lands. If the lands were not ours by at least analogous right, why propose to transfer them at all? And why, in giving us our own, propose to prevent us doing as we pleased with our own? British Columbia does as she pleases with her lands, and she pleases to use them for revenue, regardless of settlement. That is her provincial right. Commend us to Mr. Borden as the simon pure provincial rights champion. As I told him across the floor of the House, Mr. Borden was able to shed real tears over an abstract restriction regarding schools which left us free to enjoy a school system that Mr. Haultain promised not to alter if he were made dictator, but he was quite willing to tie our hands in a dollars and cents matter,—he was ready to deny us liberty to use the lands for revenue, and he declared it was the task of good statesmanship to so deny us that liberty if there was the slightest danger that we would manage the lands for revenue instead of using them to forward and assist a

vigorous immigration policy. Our land bargain has in five years given Saskatchewan roundly \$2,350,000 to apply to schools, roads and bridges, etc. Mr. Borden's policy to give us the lands and compel us to give them away would have deprived us of that handsome cash equivalent, would have burdened us with an expensive land department and a more expensive immigration service, and would have disbanded the Mounted Police Force unless the new provinces could pay the whole shot. I am giving an absolutely true outline of what Mr. Borden's policy would have meant. How do you like it? Would you prefer the Borden terms before the Laurier terms? Because in forming a judgment between the political parties on this subject it is the Laurier plan and the Borden plan which you have to contrast,—not the Laurier plan against any plan of mine or of Haultain's; Haultain and I were avowedly asking everything which ingenuity could devise. Ottawa was the arbiter. Does Mr. Haultain approve the plan of his Ottawa leader as I approve the plan of my Ottawa leader? Ask him. Ask him also if he agrees with Mr. Borden as to the non-existence of danger. Would Saskatchewan voluntarily continue to give away the lands regardless of revenue if we had them? Because otherwise Mr. Borden held that the liberty should be denied us.

### The Provinces Have Spoken

"A thing which I would like to know is how many verdicts on the land question Mr. Haultain wants. The people of Canada through their Parliament granted the terms and there is no legal or constitutional authority in existence to revoke what was done. To enforce my word I have given you Premier Roblin's word on this point. Let Mr. Haultain produce any contrary word if he can. He cannot. But since Parliament acted, its action has been judged, by the people,—of Canada and of the two interested provinces,—times almost beyond number, and always with the same result,—favorable to the terms every time. Both Saskatchewan and Alberta endorsed the terms emphatically in 1905, and since then each province has held a second general election with the same result. In the federal elections held in 1908, Saskatchewan and Alberta strongly endorsed Laurier and the land terms. Since the terms were framed in 1905 there have occurred no less than five federal bye-elections within the twin provinces. In four of these the terms

were approved by acclamation and in the fifth by a vote of about five to one. How many more verdicts can he want? Quite recently he went away from his own province to seek another verdict outside. A local bye-election was held last June in Medicine Hat, Alberta, and in the report of a campaign meeting there I read that,—

"Mr. F. W. G. Haultain after saying some nice things about the Conservative candidate tackled the lands question and spoke on this topic and on Hon. Walter Scott for an hour and a half."

"He requested another verdict on the land terms,—and he got it,—a repetition of the other verdicts and a strong repetition,—a verdict of approval of the terms by more than 500 majority. That was Hon. C. R. Mitchell's majority in the Medicine Hat bye-election. Mr. Haultain's hour and a half analysis of the Land Question and Hon. Walter Scott at Medicine Hat, Alberta, produced the same old effect, namely an emphatic verdict in favor of the land terms. Imagine, if you can, Mr. Norris of Manitoba coming into a district in Saskatchewan and asking us to pass a verdict upon Hon. R. P. Roblin. But let us not be uncharitable. I daresay the fact is that Mr. Haultain's land bargain story which he has been rehearsing these past five years, depends so entirely on the name of Scott that without Scott it would be as impossible as the play of Hamlet without the ghost."

### The Situation Reviewed

"The position, then, is that the people, who form the court of last resort, have repeatedly endorsed these land terms, in the belief that the province is better off financially with the cash grant than with lands which would have to be given away; and the Macdonald report together with Mr. Borden's proposal proves beyond doubt that we could not obtain the lands to use for provincial revenue. The opinion of the people was also doubtless affected by the fact that all of Mr. Haultain's party friends elsewhere in Canada and in Parliament denounced these land terms as being unduly generous to us; and even more affected by the further fact that in 1905 both Mr. Haultain and his chief party organ strongly approved the land arrangement. We have had, too, before our eyes Manitoba with a Conservative Government pleading with Laurier to give them Saskatchewan's terms and promising to be entirely satisfied with the same. Then the



decision which has been given by the people upon the matter is amply justified by the broad consideration of policy as regards Canada's population problem. We want the Empire to grow in strength, we want Canada to grow, we want Saskatchewan to grow, and we want to see our towns and cities grow in size and our settlers in numbers. A vigorous colonization policy in the hands of the strong central government is the best means to this end. But the absolutely conclusive reason sustaining our position is that, generous or the reverse, good or bad, satisfactory or not, the terms are the work of Parliament whose action cannot be attacked, whose authority was complete, and whose judgment in the matter is superior to that of any other tribunal. Even if we wanted the lands and gave Mr. Haultain a mandate tomorrow to get them for the province, he could not do it, no, not if he lived and continued trying to do it for the next hundred years.

#### But He Lacks Any Other Issue

"For these reasons I say that the land bargain is a false issue in our provincial business. As I stated at the outset the Saskatchewan Government is in no sense responsible for the bargain, which had been finally fixed and determined before the province existed and before the Government was called. Had I and my colleagues and the Saskatchewan Liberal party adopted the attitude on the terms of Mr. Haultain and his party, the province would still have the same terms. We could not alter them any more than Roblin can alter Manitoba's terms. Was it not better at the outset of the province, is it not better now, that the time and energies of our people and public men shall not be wasted in agitating a question which cannot be altered? Is it not wiser to devote attention to the practical problems of education and transportation and agriculture regarding which we have authority and responsibility? Can we not thus better assist the colonization efforts of the federal government and do our share in promoting our own growth and the growth of Canada and the Empire, so that the time may soon end when our absurd paucity of population can be held as a reproach? If we are true Canadians can we afford to be careless about Canada's crying problem, the problem of peopling this vast country? Can we afford to ignore the national outlook and purpose and confine ourselves to the outlook and purpose of narrow provincialism? Are we not indeed serving the ends of our own

prosperity best by helping to promote the speediest possible growth of the Dominion?

"Can any man find fault with my suggestion that Mr. Haultain adheres to this land bargain issue simply and wholly because he can find no proper ground of attack against us? The record of the results of his onslaughts upon us since the beginning is a sorry tale for him. In 1905 he used the school question. Not that he opposed our system,—the system he agreed was perfection itself,—but it pained him to be coerced into maintaining that perfect system. The attitude he adopted was simply too ridiculous, and before we got far in the campaign he abandoned it and issued a manifesto declaring that he would accept the autonomy school clause and be satisfied with the Scott Government but for the astounding evidence in his possession showing that I had entered a compact with Archbishop Langevin to destroy the school system. When challenged to produce his evidence, he could not find it in his clothes and in five intervening years he has not found it. His manifesto was nothing more nor less than an impudent, unblushing, unpardonable falsehood. And to make it a thousand times worse he did not stick at forging the Archbishop's name to an anonymous letter to make his falsehood look plausible. Even that was not enough. He conspired with his henchman McInnis to swear and publish an affidavit accusing me of personal bribery,—his new bosom friend and counsellor. McInnis whom I have heard him describe many times in previous years as a man whose oath he would not believe. All Canada knows the outcome of that episode. Did it shed lustre upon Mr. McInnis or upon his fellow conspirator Mr. Haultain? The events of 1908 are fresh in the public mind. More scandal cries,—the Morang Reader graft accusation,—the Lyall Contract insinuations,—the parliament building site complaint. We carried the war into Africa. Another libel case disclosed that in his Lieutenant Laird, Mr. Haultain had little more to boast of in the way of purity than in his Provincial Rights President McInnis. Read Judge Newlands' charge and tell me what you think of a City Mayor who would

#### Bleed His Election Funds

out of the city contractors,—by Laird's own testimony in the box \$1,000 was the tribute levied upon Dobson & Fry, and by the testimony of Fry and Dobson a tender was 'fixed,' that is to say a tender price was raised by collusion with Laird to enable them to take Regina City's money and pay it back to

Laird. Also bear in mind that both Dobson and Fry were Tory friends of Laird and unwilling witnesses. The Morang graft charge also was probed to the bottom, and where did it leave Mr. Haultain? What remains of the parliament building site complaint? When the site was selected Mr. Haultain told the Winnipeg Telegram that we had broken the law by going outside Regina City for ground, but last winter in the Assembly he declared that he had always been in favor of the site. In 1908 the cry was shouted all over the province that the Lyalls got our building contract by Laurier's dictation. Laurier gave the order and Scott had to obey, was The Standard's report of Haultain's words in the Regina City Hall, but when faced for proof on the floor of the House last winter, did he make good? No, he washed his hands of the statement, denied ever making it. Even The Standard could not swallow that. The Standard reporter in a published statement declared that nothing but Mr. Haultain's own words were reported. On the authority of his own organ, therefore, he prevaricated. His word is not good. What, then, is left him as ground for attack? Oh, yes, there is still the Supplementary Revenue Act, which he says robs the settler for the sake of high schools. But, stay, even this tune has gone wrong. His latest grievance against the Act is that by it the settler robs the corporations, the big company land owners, and the speculators for the sake of the district schools. I admit the kernel of this charge, but I deny the robbery. The Act has in three years made the speculators pay nearly half a million dollars for education, but this was not robbery,—it was simply a fair application of the good principle that all property should be equitably taxed for education, a principle recognized and practiced by every civilized nation in the world.

"The Supplementary Revenue Act has already proved its excellence. The separate school question is a dead and buried issue in Saskatchewan. Scandal cries are not so much to his liking since the Laird trial and the Morang Readers enquiry, on the top of the notorious failure of the sweet-scented McInnis method of ham-stringing a

Government. The parliament buildings are in the right place and the Lyalls are constructing them creditably. Was ever a Government so convincingly and notably vindicated upon the issues and grievances alleged against it? Did ever an Opposition so

### Lamentably Fall Down

in its attacks? Even the Hudsons Bay road, which the Tories used as a political football for a generation,—they say so themselves,—even that project they lack as a complaint against us any longer, because thanks to our persistent efforts and our straight stand in favor of federal construction, the work on the road is now under way. Our own branch lines policy is rapidly achieving its purpose. They ridiculed our red-lined railway map two years ago. They said our policy was useless and that the provincial credit was worthless to procure railway construction. Two short years have shown up their attack as senseless. Capitalists and railway companies find our provincial credit gilt-edged, and the G. T. P. and C. N. R. have eagerly contracted with us to build no less than 1,600 miles of branch lines, covering practically all the red lines on the 1908 map. Bereft of any proper issue, failing in every attack, unable to make any criticism stick with regard to the work and the policies for which the Saskatchewan Government is responsible, Mr. Haultain and his false pretences party are cordially welcome to all the encouragement which can be extracted from the bare bones of this land bargain with which the Government of Saskatchewan had no more to do and possesses no more power regarding than with Halley's comet or the Panama canal. If as an issue its bones have not been picked bare in four provincial general elections and a federal general election with all the bye-elections occurring in five years, not forgetting that of Medicine Hat where Mr. Haultain talked land terms and Walter Scott for an hour and a half, at all events I do think that the scanty shreds remaining on the bones in a future campaign will furnish exceedingly dry and barren nutriment for the political party depending on them for sustenance."



WITH COMPLIMENTS OF

Walter Scott,